App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1933-34 (Mug)

Mug 22-2-1[illegible]

Mug File No. 336-33

Serial Nos. 1—11

Letter References.

310-35-1-3

Mug 22/176-36

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 10

Part B for January 1936

SUBJECT.

The management of the Sri Kasi Viswesvara Swamy Temple at Prahladapura, Periyapatam Taluk

No 868

Dy 20-12-35

To

WD 03607—GPB—22,500—2 8-35

The Deputy Commr

Mysore

Approves his action and request to get the Scale of income and Expenditure of the Temple Documents

and Revenue Secretariat

A visitor desiring to see any officer is requested to send up his name, stating the nature of his business.

Name Mr Krishna Rao
Son of Mr. Balaji Rao
of Maladevanpura,

Whom he wishes to see

I ex. Member of Council

Business

wish to submit a memorial
reg. ending the Management of the
Sree Kasi Veshweswara Temple, Malavalli
Seringapatam Tk.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

G.R.S. III—3] 99

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Address:—

1143 Bajjanna's Lane,
Chamarajapuram
Mysore.

(1) For orders of the Govt may be forwarded to me for disbursal
a report if necessary — 4
the Govt informed accordingly
Gs
22/3

3/4.

May be sent to me.
for report.
Gs
5/4/33

Fri Secy)

N
5/4/33
2/6/4

Memo of forwarding for the Govt
for the Dist to issue to praise
petitioner to furnish
Signature —
Gs
2/6/4

Acknowledgement-card
the petitioner no 1483 912
33

Endorsement dated 11/4
No 1483 912

N.B —Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc. not intended for permanent record.]

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on both sides, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on

GENL. & REV. SECT. 1038 17. 1933

THE PALACE, BE.[illegible]

29th March 1933.

The petition, of which particulars are given below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is forwarded with compliments for favour of disposal.

Rev 336-33-3

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.
Bangalore

CHIEF SECRETARY 31 MAR. 1933 R/31/2

By Order

For Huzur Secretary
to H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

No. 584 of 32-33

From Sri K. Krishna Rao praying for the Restoration of the management of the temple to him as it was to him the family of the founder of the Mahade Jahagir and should not belong to the Jahagir lands and also permission to conduct the car festival.

(A note, This time be sent to M.C. in Chitradurga Means Rs 1448 & 12/4/33

(8) yes 14/4

4) Means of forwarding petition and action P.A. may kindly be signed.

19 Apr

Sent to M.C with no. 17/4 1463 & 17-4-33

Petition of 28-8-1933 from Mr M. Krishna Rao, No. 1143. Bajjannais lane Chamaraj a forecame Mysore requesting that the management of Sri Kasi Viswesvara temple at Mahadevapura Veeragapasam Dalavoi be entrusted to him for reasons detailed therein.

Petition of 28/7/33 addressed to H. H. the same gentleman on the subject.

11) The second petn on the subject was sent to M.C. vide this Office Cir. No. 1463 of 17.4.33. It was received from the same gentleman

The present two petns will be sent to M.C. in continuation.

12 for record —

G.V. 29/4

13) Yes 29/4

14 Memo of forwarding back up papers is to be issued to applicant —

G.V. 5/5

15 Issued 6/5/34

Petitions no 939. Sent to M.C for report vide no 312 of 7-9-33

Petition of 13.10.33 from Mr M. Krishna Rao Bajjannais Lane - Mysore praying for reasons set forth therein that the management of the temple at Mahadevapura Veeragapasam may be restored to him.

16 This is a fourth petn on the Report called from the M.C. is not

Serial No.

18) Mr. Appadu, the P. W. D. Circle Secretary to M C
to Continuation of the Periodical
Communications with a request to have
Copies of the Sub Engineer already
called for.
G.J
25/10

19
27/10/33

Jl Secy

20) Yes.
AD
28/10/33
28/10

notification of 20/10/33 addressed to the Deputy Chairman under Same Subject. (D.No. 4520 of 33-34)

21
Memo of the Municipal Commissioner
on the P. W. D. to the Chairman
Engineer
28/10

22)
3/11/33

How many. Correct the two lines!!!

Petition with its enclosure sent to M. C with no. 611 dt. 6-11-33.

7/11

Memo No 2452 dated 29. 6. 1934
From the P. S to Deputy
Forwards a petition from Mr M. Balaji Rao
Jahagirdar of Matadalapur regarding temple
affairs in the Village.
23) Report called for from the M.C is
awaited. This petition will also be sent to

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

WD 70—GBPM—60 000—13-8-3.

Temple affairs in Mahadeshwaramalai

Mewas File No. 346 of 1937. General Secret

to keep in Continuation of the previous petition dated 20.10.1933 with the request to expedite submission of the report called for.

1877
4/7) 24 This may be done.
28/7/34
Jt Secy) 25) 7/7
2/7/7
26) Memo on the petition in file
1877 2/12/7

Petn sent to Mewas Chela with no 46 of 13-7-34
Petition of 18/2/35 from Mr Balaji Rao Bajjannas King - Chamarajapuram Mysore praying that he may be given the possession and management of the Devadaya Vritti & the temple of Sri Kasi Viswesvara Swami of Mahadeshwara Betta &c.

Sec A 23/7

A report has been called for in this Secretariat file on the subject, vide Mr Kamp's Secy's Memo Sent & M.C. on 13.7.34. If agreed this file may be sent in Continuation

Serial No.

Called for — Docs —

G.S. 6/3

Yes 6/3

Memo of forwarded papers on the P.W.D is for kind signature —

G.S. 8/3

8/3

Petition sent to M.C. with no 1189 dt 8-3-35 —.

Letter No C 1161/32-33 dt 4.12.1935 from the Manager & Commissioner submitting that the management of Sri Kasi Vishweswara Swami temple at Mahadevapura Seringapatam Tk by Sundara M. Lakshmi Kanthamma dtd is in arrears

The income from the landed properties of the temple is Rs 108/- p.a. (Rupees one hundred & eight only). Pandaravadi fees Rs 15/- p.a. is in arrears. Unrealised.

Hence long since the Pdra has remained unrealised & collection & remit to the extent of Rs 15/- p.a. has been in arrears. The income of the temple is a matter for further being looked into by the Committee concerned officials — As the affairs of the temple are retarded due to poor condition & income from temple lands is utilised for the purpose for which it is intended there are no good reasons to disclose the the present management hence I submit.

GS 12-12-35

Hon. G.S.

Please peruse your note.

6/3 — Memo issued from this office are also indicated in the margin. N.C.T. GS 13-12-35

It is a point for consideration

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 0484—GPB—15,000—12 10-33

Management of Sri Kasivisweswara
Mahadeva Sivan Sringaparam Tr

File No. 3/13 of 1933

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

The Govt. have ordered in G. O. No. 2239-41 Judy. 269-22-2 dated 10th May 1923 that a scale of income and expenditure should be fixed before the management of the temple is handed over to Sardar Lakshmi-ranthamaja Urs. The orders of Govt. on this point have not yet been given effect to. (Vide the P. R. D.). I think it is a point for consideration whether ~~it is desirable that the~~ petitioners ~~to the management of the~~ should not be deprived of their right to the management of the temple. ~~The~~ a scale of income and expenditure is drawn up, ~~in spite of~~ and sanctioned by Govt in contravention of the orders contained in the G. O. of 10th May. It is also a point for consideration whether it is not desirable that orders on the petition should be passed after a scale of income and expenditure is sanctioned.

M. C/o letter dt 4.12.35 (Rev) to be perused. In the case explained to me no further action seems necessary. He may be asked to expedite action in re to fixing a scale.

13/12/35

Gen: Secy)

GENERAL SECT.
13 DEC. 19

Management of Sri Kasi Viswesvara Swami temple - Mahadevapura Srirangapatana Tk

General and Revenue Secretariat — Muz File No. 336 of 1933. — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.	
36	The petition and the Muz. Comr's report of 4/12/35 are for perusal.. In the Circ[t] report the Muz Comr's proposal may be approved Hw 14/12 First Member) 14/12
37	JOZ 16/12 Hw 17/12 17/12
	Dft dated 18/12 18/12
38	Letter no 85.80 20.12.1935 from the Muzrai Commissioner Sanctioning his proposal and requesting him to take action to get the scale of income and Expenditure for the Institution Sanctioned —

1 : DEC 1935
18 DEC 193[illegible]
NL & REVENUE SECT.
Attns 7-1-36

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13-7 35

File No. of 193

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
TO HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

No. 548/Enc.1

31st August 1933.

257.

The petition, of which particulars are given below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is forwarded with compliments for favour of disposal, in continuation of this office No 1951 dated 11.7.33

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

By Order,

for Private Secretary
to H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

No. 69. of 33-34

From Rao. Bahadur Krishna Rao, Superintendent of Temples & Choultries on the Muzrai Jahagir

RB
19
1/119

WD 688—GBPM—500—19-10-32

Mrz .10

Dewan Bahadur M N Krishna Rao Esq BA
336-337
First Member of Council
In Bangalore
Mysore
Baroda



The most humble and respectful memorial of Db Krishna Rao

Son of Db Balaji Rao Descendant of Rama Rao Dewan and Bakshi

He served under General Harris and Major-General Arthur Wellesley in the battles of Assaye and Seringapatam In recognition of his valuable and distinguished services His Highness the Maharaja Sree Krishnaraja Wodeyar was pleased to grant him the ~~life possession of~~ Sthalapuri of Dhalakeswarapuram and seven villages as Swarnamanya.

He divided into the villages into 28 Unkhas. ~~and~~ out of the 28 Unkhas he gave away 15 Unkhas to Brahmans. and kept 8 Unkhas to the temple "Sree Kasi Vishweswara Temple" and the rest he kept to himself as Zamindar

In the year 1907 the villages were taken possession of by one Padmaraja pandit by a decree in ~~District~~ Munsif's court and the management of the temple remained in the hands of ~~the~~ the predecessors of the memorialist. The immovable properties and the three Unkhas were the only properties that were given possession to him by a decree of the District court.

The memorialist has submitted a copy of the order of the Revenue commissioner regarding the management of the Temple of Sree Kasi Vishweswara Temple at Dhalakeswarapuram Seringapatam Taluq

Reference to the Government Proceedings 1880 dated 7th 5189-20th numbered That the management of the temple should be in his hands of the Brahmins alone through the Sthalapuri ought have been hypothecated, the management of the temple should be in the hands of the family descendants

He wished to submit another draft from the letter no 1198/55 of 19-6-09

The only alternative is to permit the owners mentioned in the will to take separate possession and this will give Rama Rao the absolute control of Seshadry and Dhareswaraswamy all- & Board also of Dhalakeswarapuram and Hunasagally which were set up for religious and charitable purposes" from Superintendent Attapram Outstation to the secretary to the church commissioners

Last year the car festival was stopped
for the last 102 years and 8 Vrittis have been
The purchaser are Sundar Lakshminkantaiya who does
go to the village and as the memorialist is a man of
wishes and anxious to see that the car festival and
festivities are revived, and wishes that the management
of the temple may kindly be given over to him as the
temple is not managed and the purpose for which
the Vrittis are not carried to its fullest extent and
as the descendant of the family is quite prepared
to manage the temple and its vrittis to its fullest extent
and fulfil the purpose for it which was left. The manage-
-ment of the temple was not given to Padmanajapandit
though he had managed the property and tried his best
to get it. It was to lie in the hands of the descendants
of the family. Vide and that his branches should manage it.
Vide No. 5189-20 Government proceedings. 885 of 1880 January 7th.
The festival was going on for the last 102 years and last year it was stopped
and he hopes you will enable him to perform this year.

He begs to remain
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
Mr Krishna Rao
S/o M. Balaji Rao
1143 Bajjanna's Line
Chamarajapuram
Mysore

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSR
No 1141/32 33.
13. APR. 1933
IN MYSORE

No. H. 1099/32.
memo
forwarded to the Sub Asst Commr
Periya Patna, for early report.
Mysore
12.4.33

1448/Misc/12-4-33
For wanted information of the Muzrai
Commissioner for favour of a report.
By order

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
No. 6...
20 APR. 1933
PERIYAPATNA DISTRICT

8560
Rec 5/5/33
Fwd

32-33

11/4/33
For Financial Secretary to Govt.
G.S. No. memo
forwarded with compliments to the Dy
Commr Mysore for favour of an early
report

H.1099/32
01/4/33.

15.4.33
For Muzrai Commr

To.



9/70.584.

His Highness the Maharaja Sri Sree Krishnaraja Wodeyar G C S I G C B

Maharaja of Mysore

Humble and respectful memorial of Mb Krishna Rao.

Son of Mb Balaji Rao. Great- grand. Son of Rama Rao. Dewan and Bakshi

He served under General Harris and Major General Arthur Wellesley

He was the Dewan of Mysore after Poornaiah to His Highness Sree

Krishnaraja Wodeya

He was given the Inam the Sahagre of Mahadevapur and

other villages., as Swvamanya

May it Please your Highness.

Rama Rao set apart the villages of Mahadevapur and

Hunsagally for religious and charitable purposes. except the

villages which were kept apart as personal to the Sahukar

The car-festival is held once in an year and the proceeds of

seven other villages are utilised for the car festival. and has not

to do with the Sahagire villages. The car festival issued to be

performed in every chaitra Shudha Poornima day. The memorialist

hopes that the car festival which is being performed every

year for the last one hundred and fourteen years (114 years,

may be kindly be allowed to be performed as he is the direct descend

of the original founder only last year it has been stopped

as Sudar Lakshmikantiaya and not going to the village at-all

He hopes that your Highness will be kind and gracious enou-

gh to restore the temple management to lie in the hands

of the Descendants and worshipt their family Deity.

It was most unfortunate that car festival which i

being performed for the last 114 years should have been

last year. Though lands and villages have been left but it every year to utalise the produce.

As it is his family deity and the car festival may kindly be allowed by their descendents. Though the Jahagire has been sold is performed it does not in the least inconvenience the purchaser if the manage-ment of the family deity and the temple management is to be in the hands of the members of the family -

Govt Proceedings 1880 January 7th 885 No 5189-90

The Jahagire was once mortgaged to one Padmanaya-pandit in 1895 alone and the management of the temple and not so to him. But it lay in the hands of the family members. When Padmanayapandit filed a suit to the possession in the District-court, the management of the temple was did not given so to him, except only the Jahagire village and other unmovable properties He hopes that your Highness will be kind and gracious enough as to allow the members of the family to perform the car-festival and the same last hopes that your Highness shall be graciously pleased as to restore the management of the Temple as allow him to perform the car-festival which was put her performed from 114 years and not allow it to be stopped this year also, as seven villages have been left by the original owner for that purpose. He has enclosed the copy of the proceedings of the Government which gives that right the Jahagire villages away in time the possession of others, the temple management which ought to be in the hands of the members of the family itself.

It was in the possession of this father when the village was given to the Posses of the Mortgagee. For this act of kindness and grace he ever remain grateful to

He begs to remain
Your Highness's most
obedient Servant

M Krishna Rao
c/o 114 3 Bazaar Street
Chamarajapuram.
Bangalore

Forwarded / Mysore Commissioner
in Continuation of Memo No 14488
12.4.1933.

By order

For Financial Secretary

Memo
Forwarded with compliments
to the Dy Commr Mysore Dt
for favor of an early report
in continuation of this office
memo No C 1141/32-33 Dy 18.4.33.

For Mysore Commr

19.4.33.

Memo H.1099/32

Forwarded to the Sub Division office
Hunsur Attn in continuation of this Dept memo
No H.1099/32 dated 21-4-33 for early report.

For Deputy Commissioner

Memo
Forwarded to the
Huildar of Seringapatam for report in
Continuation of this office memo No: A3-1350/32-33 dated 5-5-33

Sub Dy office Hunsur

Memo
Forwarded to the
Talukdar of Seringapatam for report in
Continuation of this office memo No: A3-1350/32-33 dated 5-5-33

Sub Dy office Hunsur

Klu Mysore Taluk



GENL. & REV. SECT. SECRETARIAT
239
30. AUG. 1933

Dewan Bahadur Rajasabhaprasakta
M. K. Krishna Rao.
Dewan and President in council
in Mysore

Bangalore 29.8.33

Trans 29.8.33

NDIA ECRETARY
9

263

Mis 336-33-5

reference to letter no. 1450 Mbng. dated 7-4-1933 -

29/8

The most humble and respectful memorial of M. Krishna Rao son of M. Balagi Rao great grandson of Rama Rao Dewan and Bakshi. He served under General Harris and Major General Arthur Wellesley in the battles of Assaye and Wagram. In recognition of his valuable and distinguished services His Highness the Maharaja Krishna Raja Wodeyar III was pleased to grant the Jahagir of Mahadevapur and other villages as Inam Sarvamanya (free)

The memorialist wishes to place before you the following few lines to your kind and gracious consideration.

Sir,

The Jahagir was granted to Rama Rao for his services rendered to the State. As heavy debts were incurred by the memorialist grandfather Rama Raom it was obligedto be sold.

In the year 1895 the Jahagir was hypothicated to one A. Padmarajapanditha for Rs. thirty-two thousand. He accordingly filed a suit in the District Court, Mysore Civil Suit No.12 of 1896-97 for the possession of the villages. The deed contained in it the full right on the villages and only five Vrithies which were termed as Yejman.

In the year 1907 the memorialist's father and his uncles sold the villages and only five Yejman Vrithies to one H. Krishna Rao who sold it to the third Princess Chaluvajavilas Sannidhana

Chaluvaja Vilas Sanndhana the rights she had got from H. Krishna Rao.

Unfortunately the position and the management of the temple have been taken possession. H.Krishna Rao had no right over the management of the temple. It is not included in his sale deed. The very words of all rights and onle mention of 5 Mejman Vrithies are included in the two sale deeds.

The management of the temple was under the management of the Government VideProceedings 4733-6 No.78 dated 28th March 1907,- 2-4-1907 Pelacota, under orders contained in the Government Proceedings of the 24th July 1905. A. Padmarajanandita the decree holder does not appear to have interfered the management owing to obstruction of Balaji Rao and some brahmins.

Government do not consider it necessary that the enjoyer of the Veja an Vrithies wh ever he may be should alone be the manager of the temple furth r there seems to be a strong sentiment against a Jain managing the temple affairs.

There is no objection h wever to place the management of the temple and its affair in the hands of Balaji Rao. But as there were complaints against Rama Rao and it is doubtful Balaji Rao his son would be able to manage properly.

The Government therefore deem it un esirable to give the management of the temple to A. Padmaraja-nandita.

Government are pleased to direct that the management of the temple and its affairs be placed temporarily for a period of two years in the hands of the Amildar. The Amildar should place all the templea affairs in proper order. After things are put in proper order Government will consider whether the manage

managementof the temple may be transferred to Balaj Rao Surlate Jahagirdar.

A. Padmarajapanditha decree holder appealed to Government and it was decided that that enjoyer of the Vejman whoever he may be need not be the manager of the temple and its Vrithies.

Vide No. 1779 dated 15th October 1903, Revenue Commissioner's Order. There 28 Vrithies in Mahadevapur and Hunnasagally. Five Vrithies are reserved as Vejman. the other 8 were reserved to the temple and rest to Brahmins. Ever since it was given to Rama Rao as Inam by His Late Highness Krishnaraja Wodeyar III it has been managed and enjoyed by the heirs of Rama Rao. The five Vejman Vrithies including all the other immovables were hypothicated to A. Padmarajapanditha. He filed a suit and obtained a decree in his favour and got possession of five Vejman Vrithies.

By the following reasons the Revenue Commissioner' reversed the Order, A brahmin nor onw who does not practice brahminism to manage the temple and its Vrithies is against the clauses laid down by the Sanad. The hypothicatee is the owner of the portionof the village.

Vide Government Proceedings No.5189-90 of 888 No. 7th January 1880, though the village is sold to others the management of the temple cannot go to him who is other than brahmin.

. Padmarajapanditha is unfit to manage the temple. The only solution is to question the Right.

The management Hakku (Right) belongs to one who has received as a special Inam and it is but right to place the management in the family representative.

With reference to his petition dated 17-7-1909 regarding the management of Hunasagally Inam villages in T. Narasipur Taluq, Mr. Rama Rao is informed that orders have issued to the Sub-Division stating that the management of

of the aforesaid villages does not belong to Padmaraja-Pandithe.

Memo No. 287
Dated 20-7-1905

(sd) H. H. Sparke
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

The memorialist wishes to state that the temple Vrithies were not included in the hypothicated deed not in the sale deed of M. Krishna Rao. M.Krishna Rao 's sale deed to Chaluvaia Vilas(Manager Sardar Lakshmi anth raja Urs) He has sold all the rights and immovable properties and only the mention of 5 Vrithies are mentioned in his bond.

The memorialist wishes to place before you Sir, in his petition dated 24-11-1930 Sardar Lakshmikantha raja Urs has stated that the management of the temple is not going on ~~xxxxx~~ properly and he was forced to stop the Rathotsava last year as the Brahmins has not co-operated with Him. Further he says it is impossible to manage the temple as there are not any brahmins residing the Agrahar. The Agamika does not reside in Mahadev pur and only nonbrahmins reside in the Agrahar.

He further states that he has got to elect some non-brahmins as Dharmadarsis and has requested the Deputy Commissioner to force these brahmins to co-operate with him,if not the management of temple will have to be managed by the nonbrahmins and it will not be managed properly. This clearly shows that Sardar is tired of managing it. Besides as the memorialist is the legal male representative and has got more interest in his family deity and ancestral temple which was built and the Rathothsavas were being performed for one hundred years continuously without any break and only brahmins are managing it. He hopes that you willbe kind and gracious to kindly place the management

management of the temple in the handsof the representative of the family so that he can well perform the duties of the family and God. As t not managed well thoug eight Vrithies are alloted to it and the Rathothsavam was stopped and the Sardar has got to appoint some non-brahmins to manage the Hindu Temple which was never in vogue. He has stated the management not going on properly. Besides the management of the temple and its Vrithies are not included in the bond of H. Krishna Rao from whom the third Princess ith Sardar Lakshmikantha raja Urs has purchased it. He hopes that you will be ind and gracious enough as to place the management in the hands of the memorialist, for which act kindness and grace he ever remains grateful.

For this act of kindness and grace he ever remains Grateful. He has enclosed copies of Extracts.

Your most obedient servant,

M. Krishna Rao.

28.8.1933

No. 1143 Bajjanna's Line

Chamarajapuram,

M Y S O R E .

No 312/Mis § 7-9-33 (to the Nawab
Forwarded both Complainants petitions
with another petition of 28/7/33 on the
subject addressed to His Highness.
The Maharaja for favour of
Memo Nos 1448 of 12.4.33 and 1463 of
17.4.33, ~~on the same subject~~

By order

Superintendent 6/9/33
for Financial Secretary
to Govt

SEP 1933

Sir George Malcolm Stuart Bard Esq IC
Dewan of Mysore
Bangalore

Gen. Pln. No. 7
Mis 336-33-7

The most humble and respectful memorial of M. Krishna Rao son of M. Balaji Rao, great grand son of Rama Rao, Dewan and Bakshi. He served under General Harris and Major General Arthur Wellesley. He was the Dewan after Poorniah to Sir Sree Krishnaraja Wadeyar III.



The memorialist wishes to place before you the following few lines to your kind and gracious consideration.

The recognition of the valuable and distinguished services His Highness Sir Sree Krishnaraja Wadeyar III was pleased to give in Inam the Jahagire of Mahadevapur and other villages as Surva-manya (Rent free)

As heavy debts were incurred by the memorialist's grand-father His father and uncles sold the Jhagire villages to me H. Krishana Rao who sold it to the third Princess Cheluvaraja Sannidhana. Unfortunately the management of the temple has been taken possession t through H.Krishna Rao had no right to the possession of the management of the temple.

Besides the temple was under Government management when it was was sold to H. Krishna Rao. Vide Government Proceedings 4733 No 78 dated 28th March 1907 - 2 - 4 - 1907. Melocata under orders contained in the Government Proceedings of the 24th July 1905"Government do not d consider it necessary that the enjoyee of th Yejaman Vrithies whoever he may be should alone be the manager of the temple."

"After things are put in proper order Government will consider whether the management may be transferred to Balaji Rao, son of Late Jahagirdar."

The memorialist wishes to place before you, Sir, that the tmeple Vrithies were not included in the sale deed of H. Krishna Ra nor had Krishna Rao mentioned in his sale deed to the Third Princess. Krishna Rao had right over the five Yejaman Vrithies and it is mentioned in the sale deed and no mention of temple Vrithies is mentioned in the sale deed.

Besides the memorialist wishes to place before you Sir, the extract from a xopy of Regular appeal No 162 of 1904 - 1910 dated 21-2-1911 in the court of District K Judge Mysore over this question.

On 2nd appeal this appeal was remanded to this court for fresh disposal on the ground that no finding had been come to on the only point for decision in the appeal Viz., whether by the aforesaid mortgage right to the management of the temple passed to the Defendant from the Plaintiff's father and his sons.

"On hearing of the appeal Mr. M.L. Narasimhiahgar for the appeallent contented that the right did not pass under the mortgage as the right of management of the Hindu Temple dead Extra commercum and inalienable. (Ghoses Hindu Temple Law of Endowment page 367 (1908 Serkars Hindu Law P.P.446-447 3rd edition. But under the ordinary principle of the trust Law a trustee can not divest himself of a trust except in certain prescribed ways among those an alienation of the trust property is certainly not included; moreover the mortgagors and they could not include in that mortgage the right of management of the temple which they held in trust for the community using the temple. (4T.R. 76.) quoted in Sirkar M.L.P. 447 (3rd Edition) This is not a case where the founder the temple applied his own property itself and the control over it in his own hands in the contrary he built the temple and founded an agrahar of Brahmins allotted certain of the 28 Vrithies into which ~~khe~~ he had divided the village granted to him as Inam to the Brahmins. Certain others he allotted to the temple and certain other (the five Yejman Vrithies) subsequently mortgaged to the Defendant) he reserve to himself.

"That the mortgage du did not in fact pass the right of the managment of the temple is clearly shown in the overnment under No. R. 1030-31 / MO. 572-03 dated 24th July 1906."

"This not only clearly who shows that by the mortgage the management of the temple ofx did not pass to the Defendant."

"I am therefore of opinion that by the mortgage the right of management of the temple did not pass from the Plaintiff's father and his sons to the mortgagee the fatherof the Defendant."

I therefore hold the ri ht of management vests by succession in the Plaintiff I accordingly set aside the find ngs and decree of the Lower Court. On the ground that the said right of management of the emple did not vest in him."

(Sd). R.B. PLUMER
District Judge.

The memorialist wishes to state that themanagement of the temple may kindly be given back to him as it is to be held in succession and in inalienable.

M. Krishna Rao

13th Oct.1933
MYSORE.

He begs to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient servent,

Add:-
143 Bajjanals Lane,
MYSORE.

1141
35-38

NOV 1933
NCS/-

memo no 611/Mis 9 6-11-33.
Forwarded with compliments
to the Chief Commissioner in
Continuation of this Office Memo
No 312 dy. 7.9.33 in the request that
Sending the Memorialist may be expedited
Report also and Call for
Another petition addressed to the Govern ment
Subject is also enclosed.

sent out 9.11.33

B Munisamappa
3/11/33
for Finance Secretary

23.10.33

To

Sir Mirza M. Ismail Kt BA CIE. DB E.B 698/24

Dewan of Mysore

Bangalore

The most humble and respectful memorial of M. Krishna Rao son of M. Balaji Rao great grandson of Rama Rao Dewan and Bakshi. He served under General Harris and Major General Arthur Wellesley in the battles of Assaye and Wagram. In recognition of his valuable and distinguished services His Highness the Maharaja Krishna Raja Wodeyar III was pleased to grant the Jahagir of Mahadevapur and other villages as Inam Sarvamanya (free)

The memorialist wishes to place before you the following few lines to your kind and gracious consideration.

Sir,

The Jahagir was granted to Rama Rao for his services rendered to the State. As heavy debts were incurred by the memorialist grandfather Rama Rao it was obliged to be sold.

In the year 1895 the Jahagir was hypothicated to one A. Padmarajapanditha for Rs. thirty-two thousand. He accordingly filed a suit in the District Court, Mysore Civil Suit No.12 of 1896-97 for the possession of the villages. The deed contained in it the full right on the villages and only five Vrithies which were termed as Yejman.

In the year 1907 the memorialist's father and his uncles sold the villages and only five Yejman Vrithies to one H. Krishna Rao who sold it to the third Princess Chaluvajavilas Sannidhana

management of the temple may be transferred to Balaj Rao Sorlate Jahagirdar.

A. Padmarajapanditha decree holder anpealed to Government and it was decide d that that enjoyer of the Yejman whoever he may be need not be the manager of the temple and its Vrithies.

Vide No. 1772 dated 15th October 1903, Revenue Commissioner's Order. There 28 Vrithies in Mahadevapur and Hunnasagally. Five Vrithies are reserved as Yejman. the other 8 were reserved to the temple and rest to Brahmins. Ever since it was given to Rama Rao as Inam by His Late Highness Krishnaraja Wodeyar III it has been managed and enjoyed by the heirs of Rama Rao. The five Yejman Vrithies including all the other immovables were hypothicated to A. Padmarajapanditha. He filed a suit and obtained a decree in his favour and got possession of five Yejman Vrithies.

By the following reasons the Revenue Commissioner' reversed the Order, A brahmin nor one who does not practice brahminism to manage the temple and its Vrithies is against the clauses laid down by the Sanad. The hypothicatee is the owner of the portion of the village.

Vide Government Proceedings No.5189-90 of 888 No. 7th January 1880, though the village is sold to others the management of the temple cannot go to him who is other than brahmin.

Padmarajapanditha is unfit to manage the temple The only solution is to question he Right.

The management Hakku (Right) belongs to one who has received as a special Inam nd it is but right to place the management in the family representative.

With reference to his petition dated 17-7-1909 regarding the management of Hunasagally Inam villages in T. Narasipur Taluq, Mr. Rama Rao is informed that orders have issued to the Sub-Division stating that the management of

of the aforesaid villages does not belong to Padmaraja-Panditha.

Memo No. 287
Dated 20-7-1905

(sd) H. H. Sparke
Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

The memorialist wishes to state that the temple Vrithies were not included in the hypothicated deed not in the sale deed of H. Krishna Rao. M.Krishna Rao 's sale deed to Chaluvaia Vilas(Manager Sardar Lakshmikanth raja Urs) He has sold all the rights and immovable properties and only the mention of 5 Vrithies are mentioned in his bond.

The memorialist wishes to place before you Sir, in his petition dated 24-11-1930 Sardar Lakshmikantha raja Urs has stated that the management of the temple is not going on properly and he was forced to stop the Rathothsava last year as the Brahmins has not co-operated with him. Further he says it is impossible to manage the temple as there are not any brahmins residing the Agrahar. The Agamika does not reside in Mahadeshwar and only nonbrahmins reside in the Agrahar.

He further states that he has no to elect some non-brahmins as Dharmadarshi and has requested the Deputy Commissioner to force these brahmins to co-operate with him,if not the management of temple will have to be managed by the nonbrahmins and it will not be managed properly. This clearly shows that Sardar is tired of managing it. Besides as the memorialist is the legal male representative and has got more interest in his family diety and ancestral temple which was built and the Rathothsavas were being performed for one hundred years continueously without any break and only brahmins are managing it. He hopes that you will be kind and gracious to kindly place the manage-

management of the temple in the hands of the representatives of the family so that he can well perform the duties of the family and God. As it not managed well though eight Vrithies are alloted to it and the Rathothsavam was stopped and the Sardar has got to appoint some non-brahmins to manage the Hindu Temple which was never in vogue. He has stated the management not going on properly. Besides the management of the temple and its Vrithies are not included in the bond of H. Krishna Rao from whom the third Princess with Sardar Lakshmikantha raja Urs has purchased it. He hopes that you will be kind and gracious enough as to place the management in the hands of the memorialist, for which act kindness and grace he ever remains grateful.

M. Krishna Rao .

Your most obedient servant,

20-10-1933

No. 1143 Bajjanna's Line
Chamarajapuram,
M Y S O R E .

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE

Bangalore, Dated, 16 1933



The accompanying petition addressed to the Dewan is forwarded, with compliments, to the Secretary to Government, Mysore

.....Department, for disposal

By Order,

Private Secretary to the Dewan.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT 4522 25. OCT. 1933 MYSORE

Bangalore, dated 23 . 10 . 1933.

The accompanying petition addressed to the Dewan is forwarded, with compliments, to the ~~Chief~~ Secretary to Government, Mungrai Department for disposal.

A similar petn on the subject
(Vide D.No. 4.24) has been
separately submitted
thereon (to be awaited of the petn)
G.S.D. (This will be placed in that file also.)
26.10

By Order,

25/10

Private Secretary to the Dewan.

Pet. No. 2405-2 OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,



Dated 29 . 6 . 1934



The accompanying petition addressed to the Dewan is forwarded, with compliments, to the Secretary to Government, Mysore Department, for disposal. 1/3/7.

By Order,

Private Secretary to the Dewan.

2.7.34

No. 2879/1

THE PALACE, MYSORE.

996 27th February 1935 193

The petition, of which particulars are given below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is forwarded with compliments for favour of disposal.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government
of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.
Bangalore.

By Order,

For *Private Secretary*
to H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

No. P.378 of 1934-35.

From Balaji Rao, Grandson of Bakshi and Deewan Rama Rao, Jaghirdar of Mahadevpur, residing at Bajjanna's Lines, Chamarajapuram, Mysore, praying that he may be given the possession and management of the Devadaya vritties and the temple of Sri Kasi Visveswara Swami of Mahadevpur.

No. C 1141/32-33
Enc. 1+2 files

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER,
IN MYSORE,

Dated, Bangalore, 2nd December REV. S. 1935.

4



FROM K. V. ANANTARAMAN, Esq., B.A.,
~~N. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., B.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

Mug 336-339

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., M.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General *Department.*



SIR,

Re: the management of the Sri Kasi Visveswara Swamy Temple at Mahadevapura, Seringapatam Taluk.

—

With reference to the Financial Secretary's Memo No.1448/Muz. dated 12-4-1933 and subsequent Memos Nos.1463/Muz., 312/Muz. dated 17-4-1933 and 7-9-1933, respectively, calling for a report on the petitions of Mr. K. Krishna Rao and another of Mysore, praying that the management of the Sri Kasi Visveswaraswamy temple at Mahadevapura Seringapatam Taluk, may be restored to them, I have the honor to state that it is reported by the Deputy Commissioner that the petitioners, Messrs. K. Krishna Rao and C. Krishna Rao, to whom notices were sent pleaded inability to appear before the Taluk Office and failed to substantiate their case and that in view of the fact that the temple and the endowed vrittis are being managed properly by the Sirdar there are no grounds to interfere with the present management.

2. In this connection, I invite kind reference to G.O.No.2239-41/Muz.269-22-2 dated 10th February 1923 directing that the management may be handed over to Sirdar M. Lakshmi Kantharaj Urs, a regular scale of income and expenditure being drawn and action also being taken for the renovation and proper maintenance of the temple. From the copy of the Deputy Commissioner's letter No.1099/32 dated 5-9-1935 sent herewith, it will be seen that even though a scale has not been formally sanctioned by Government, puja and other services in the temple are being conducted in accordance with scale fixed

Jahgirdar, that the building is being maintained properly and necessary provision has also been made in the scale for the maintenance of the building.

3. In view of the above, I agree with the Deputy Commissioner that o further action is necessary in the matter except that a scale may e sanctioned formally by Government. The petitioners will be informed ccordingly, and the Deputy Commissioner requested to submit a scale.

4. The connected file of records is enclosed herewith.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. Chandu

Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.H.1099/32 dated 5-9-35 from the Deputy Commissioner District, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Management Sri Kasivisveswaraswamy temple, Mahadevapura.

With reference to your letter No.1141 of 32-33 dated 19/25th July 1935 on the above subject, I have the honor to submit herewith a copy of the scale of expenditure which is in force in the temple, received from the Sirdar, and to state that no scale has been sanctioned by Government. The Amildar, Seringapatam Taluk, reports that puja is being done regularly in the temple, that the building is being maintained properly, and that necessary provision has also been made in the scale for meeting the maintenance charges of the building.

2.The entire records are submitted herewith.

"C O P Y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mus

File No. 336–33

Serial No. 60

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No 858 Land Records

To

The M.C

Sir,

Subject :— The Management of Sri Kasi Viswesvara Swami Temple at Mahadeshwara Betta.

With refce to correspondence ending in your letter No C 1141/ Endorsing thereon the petition of M. Krishna Gowda & others dated 4.12.1935 praying that the Management of Sri Kasi Viswesvara Swami temple at Mahadeshwara Betta may be entrusted to Sidda H. Krishna Kantharaj Urs instead of Puttaswamy Gowda & others appointed in G.O. No. [illegible] dated [illegible]

I am directed to ~~[illegible]~~

State that in the case reported your proposal is approved and to request that early action may be taken to get the Scale of fees for the temple sanctioned.

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

upon the proposal to
the Rees as suggested
by Major the D.C. Mysore,
by which a scale of allowance
now. The entire Rees
received with the letter under
advertence are herewith
returned.

I have &c

[illegible]

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

No. 858/Mog 33633-40 Revenue

Dated, Bangalore, 20th December *193* 5.

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Sir,

Subject:- The Management of Sri Kasi Visveswara Swamy Temple at Mahadevapura, Seringapatam Taluk.

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No.C.1141/32-33 submitting a report on the petition of M. Krishna Rao and ~~other~~ others of Mysore on the above subject, I am directed to state that in the circumstances reported your proposal is approved and to request that early action may be taken to get the scale of income and expenditure for the temple sanctioned.

The entire records received with your letter under advertence are herewith returned.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

for General Secretary to Government.

Aga/2.